Article:
Kubanyiova, M (2015) The Role of Teachers' Future Self Guides in Creating L2 Development Opportunities in Teacher-Led Classroom Discourse: Reclaiming the Relevance of Language Teacher Cognition. The Modern Language Journal, 99 (3). pp. 565-584. ISSN 0026-7902

https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12244

The Role of Teachers' Future Self Guides in Creating L2 Development Opportunities in Teacher-Led Classroom Discourse: Reclaiming the Relevance of Language Teacher Cognition

Magdalena Kubanyiova, University of Birmingham

Understanding the relationship between teachers' use of language in teacher-led discourse (TLD) and opportunities for L2 development is a well-established area of SLA research. This study examines one teacher's role in creating such opportunities in TLD in her EFL classes in a state secondary school by examining the 'inner resources' that informed her interactional practices. The database comprises audiorecordings of TLD from 8 lessons, pre- and post-observation interviews, ethnographic field notes from multiple school visits, and repeated ethnographic interviews with the teacher. The results from the conversation analysis of TLD and a grounded theory analysis of the ethnographic data show that the teacher's future self guides, conceptualized as language teachers' possible selves (Kubanyiova, 2009), had a critical influence on how she navigated classroom interaction and the L2 development opportunities that arose as a result. By bridging two domains of inquiry, SLA and language teacher cognition, in a single study, this article sets a new research agenda in applied linguistics and responds to calls for increasing its relevance to the real world (Bygate, 2005; Ortega, 2012a).

Keywords: teacher-led discourse, L2 development opportunities, language teacher cognition, future self-guides

Please cite as: Kubanyiova, M. (in press). The role of teachers' future self guides in creating L2 development opportunities in teacher-led classroom discourse: Reclaiming the relevance of language teacher cognition. *The Modern Language Journal*.

Studying the relationship between classroom interaction and opportunities for second/foreign language (L2) development constitutes one of the central activities of second language acquisition (SLA) research (Ellis, 2000; Gass & Mackey, 2006; Hall, 2010; Mackey & Goo, 2007; Mackey & Polio, 2009; Thoms, 2012; van Lier, 1996). Alongside the traditional focus on the L2 development potential of peer interaction (Hellermann & Cole, 2009; Kasper, 2004; Mackey, 2007b; J. Mori, 2002; Swain, Brooks, & Tocalli-Beller, 2002), there is a growing consensus in classroom discourse research that whole-class teacher-student interaction can have just as significant consequences for learners' L2 development. Understanding the conditions under which such potential can be realised has been the subject of extensive empirical and conceptual activity within the SLA field from across epistemological paradigms (Cazden, 2001; Hall, 2010; Hall & Verplaetse, 2000; Hellermann, 2003; Seedhouse, 2004; Toth, 2008, 2011; van Lier, 1988, 1996; Walsh, 2006; Waring, 2008; Wells, 1993).

Parallel to this body of research is evidence, however, that despite the empirically demonstrated acquisitional promise of, for instance, negotiated interaction (Keck, Iberri-Shea, Tracy-Ventura, & Wa-Mbaleka, 2006; Mackey, 2007b; Mackey & Goo, 2007; Ortega, 2007), very little of it takes place in teacher-student interactions in intact classrooms owing to various social dynamics, motivations, and concerns of learners and teachers (Consolo, 2000; Eckerth, 2009; Musumeci, 1996; Van den Branden, 2008). And even when a "variable approach" (Walsh, 2006) - which acknowledges language learning benefits of different interactional patterns for different pedagogic purposes - is applied to identifying L2 development affordances in TLD, research evidence highlights frequent occurrences of "deviant cases" (Walsh, 2006, p. 82) when the teachers' use of language diverges from the stated pedagogical objectives and, therefore,

disrupts the discourse cohesion that has been found crucial in fostering L2 learning opportunities in TLD (Toth, 2011; Walsh, 2002).

This study examines the missing link in this line of inquiry which concerns ways in which language teachers interpret and enact principles of beneficial TLD in their everyday instruction and what shapes this enactment. The aim is to account more fully for the role of teacher as "the practical link between SLA research and classroom practice" (Crookes, 1997, p. 93) and extend the current focus on *pedagogic* purposes of teacher-student interaction to consider a fuller range of *inner resources* that guide language teachers' discursive behaviours in the classroom and, ultimately, shape the quality of opportunities for students' L2 development.

To achieve this aim, my inquiry is located at the interface of two areas of scholarly research: TLD as a site for L2 development in instructed settings and language teacher cognition, broadly defined as an unobservable dimension of language teachers' instructional behaviours (cf. Borg, 2006). Applying elements of conversation analysis (CA), I examined the moment-by-moment unfolding of one teacher's discursive practices to understand the nature of language learning affordances that emerged through her use of language. These findings are juxtaposed by an exploration of ethnographic data which shed light on some of the key inner resources that this teacher drew on in her reasoning about, emotional responses to, and interpretations of classroom events and which shaped her TLD practices and, consequently, opportunities for students' L2 development.

Central to this article is an argument that extending the research inquiry into TLD to include an in-depth understanding of the teacher doing the talk is a promising direction for future research: not only can it contribute to a deeper appreciation of the language classroom as a rich interactional arena in which complex social psychological dynamics come to work in concert in

creating opportunities for L2 development, but it also opens up new avenues for proposing fruitful teacher education interventions needed to help language teachers harness L2 development opportunities in TLD in meaningful and significant ways (Hall, 2010; Hall & Walsh, 2002; Johnson, 1995; Thoms, 2012). Crucially in the context of this guest-edited issue, this study also demonstrates that in order to reclaim the relevance of language teacher cognition, this domain of inquiry would benefit from focusing its research lens more firmly on understanding the "hidden side" (Freeman, 2002) of those teaching practices that are consequential to students' L2 development in the language classroom. The contribution of this study is therefore in bridging what has typically been pursued as largely separate disciplines of applied linguistics, SLA and teacher cognition (Kubanyiova, 2011), to gain new understandings of the ecology of classroom interaction (van Lier, 2000) and increase the relevance of both disciplines to the real world (Bygate, 2005; Ortega, 2005, 2012a).

<A> TEACHER-LED CLASSROOM DISCOURSE AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR L2 DEVELOPMENT

Research on whole-class teacher-student interaction, henceforth teacher-led discourse (TLD), has shown that the quality of teachers' use of language in TLD can have significant consequences for students' L2 development (Hall & Walsh, 2002; Toth, 2011), often in ways that are superior to language learning benefits in learner-led discourse (Kayi-Aydar, 2013; Toth, 2008; Van den Branden, 1997). A key finding that has emerged from this body of scholarship is that TLD can be effective to the extent to which it affords opportunities for students' active participation, public (Consolo, 2000; Hall, 2010) or private (Batstone & Philp, 2013; Ohta,

2001), in the regularly occurring patterns of classroom interaction in ways that are congruent with its pedagogical purposes (Toth, 2011; Walsh, 2002).

It has been argued, for example, that what has traditionally been dismissed as a largely restrictive discursive pattern of Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) in TLD in which the teacher typically initiates an exchange by asking a question, the student responds, and the teacher provides feedback, can in fact successfully facilitate students' engagement in classroom discourse. The effectiveness depends on the purposes for which IRF is employed and how its three interactional moves are orchestrated by the teacher to involve students' participation in alignment with those purposes (Nassaji & Wells, 2000; Wells, 1993).

Proposing a "variable approach" to understanding profitable features of TLD, Walsh (2006), for instance, has presented discourse data to demonstrate that a tightly controlled IRF pattern with the teacher's extensive use of display questions and evaluative feedback in the third move of the IRF exchange is fully justified and successful in generating learning opportunities if the pedagogical aim is to enable students' practice around a piece of material or to check and display correct answers. Such interactional microcontexts have been labelled by Walsh (2006) as "materials" and "skills and systems" modes respectively.

Rather different discursive IRF strategies have been found effective in the so called "classroom context mode" (Walsh, 2006), that is, an interactional microcontext whose pedagogical aims are to encourage meaning-focused communication. Waring's (2008) research has demonstrated that in this type of interactional setting the teacher's explicit positive evaluation in the third move of the IRF exchange (e.g., "very good") can function as conversation closure and thus have negative consequences for language learning. If, on the other hand, the last turn of the triadic exchange is used to invite students to expand, elaborate, or

clarify their contributions rather than to evaluate them, useful opportunities can arise for students' meaning-making even within the confines of IRF (Hall & Walsh, 2002; Nassaji & Wells, 2000).

A number of additional features have been identified as facilitating authentic conversation in TLD, including allowing students to "speak as themselves" (Ushioda, 2011) by evoking their personally-relevant rather than learner identities in classroom conversation (Richards, 2006; Waring, 2013) and acknowledging the role of students as equal contributors to TLD (Donato, 2004). This implies a need for teachers to consider relinquishing control over the initiation and follow-up parts of the triadic exchange (Clifton, 2006; van Lier, 1996), provide opportunities for students to propose topics and build on others' contributions in a collaborative manner (Ko, 2014; Toth, 2011), create openings in TLD to enable students to move out of the IRF (Waring, 2009), and, generally, ensure that all participants in TLD share conversational goals and perceive these as legitimate for L2 development (Donato, 2004).

Some divergence, however, is evident even within this context-sensitive approach to understanding TLD. For instance, while teacher echo was found to hinder students' L2 learning opportunities in the "classroom context mode" (Walsh, 2002), Park's (2014) study has shown the opposite effect: the teacher's repeats occurring in the feedback turn of IRF exchange whose goal was to enable students to produce authentic real-time interaction (i.e., pedagogical purposes identical to those in the 'classroom context mode'), facilitated students' authentic involvement in TLD. Differences may, undoubtedly, arise due to different epistemological approaches to TLD analysis (cf. Seedhouse, 2007). Yet, evidence from across applied linguistics, including SLA (Morris & Tarone, 2003; Ortega, 2012b; Slimani-Rolls, 2005) and language teacher cognition (Kubanyiova, 2009; R. Mori, 2011) shows that classroom interaction, be it learner- or teacher-

led, is governed by a range of social, psychological, and identity-relevant dynamics in addition to, and sometimes despite, pedagogical purposes, shaping in significant ways L2 learning opportunities that arise from such interactions. Understanding these dynamics may therefore be critical to appreciating more fully what shapes L2 learning opportunities in TLD.

<A> LANGUAGE TEACHER COGNITION AS 'INNER LANDSCAPES OF ACTION'

With its aim to study internal frames of reference that language teachers bring into their classroom practices, language teacher cognition, a sub-discipline of applied linguistics, appears well placed to illuminate the "hidden" dynamics of teachers' TLD practices. This rapidly-expanding body of research (cf. Borg, 2006) is based on the recognition that what teachers do in the classroom is a reflection of a rich tapestry of their "mental lives" (Freeman, 2002) and a wide array of such mental constructs have been examined with the aim to deepen our understanding of the language teaching activity, including, among many others, beliefs (Barcelos & Kalaja, 2011), knowledge (Mullock, 2006), principles (Breen, Hird, Milton, Oliver, & Thwaite, 2001), images (Feryok & Pryde, 2012), and emotions (Golombek & Johnson, 2004).

While this research has shed considerable light on the complex mediating role of prior knowledge and beliefs, personal and professional histories, and emotional experiences in navigating what language teachers do and how they develop, some notable gaps in our understanding of the exact nature of this role remain. It has been found, for instance, that teachers' beliefs do not always correspond with their practices (cf. Basturkmen, 2012), which has led researchers to highlight the role of context as a key factor contributing to this discrepancy. Yet, apart from a legitimate consideration that this finding demands in relation to language teachers' working conditions which often do not offer a fertile ground in which their beliefs can

be enacted (Crookes, this issue), a closer look at language teacher cognition research also exposes significant differences in how teacher cognition has been conceptualised in relation to practice.

Using an example of teachers' *personal practical knowledge* (PPK), one of the constructs investigated within language teacher cognition, Golombek (2009)'s juxtaposition of two studies adopting identical terminology highlights these conceptual differences. On the one hand, Tsang's (2004) study implies operationalization of PPK as "maxims", which teachers can readily access and articulate independently of their practices as a kind of explicit knowledge, whereas Golombek (1998), on the other hand, defined PPK as experiential, storied, and personal, which encompasses affective and moral ways of knowing and can be accessed through teachers' narratives of practice. The former study found that only some of these "maxims" were reflected in language teachers' practices, while the latter concluded that teachers' PPK permeated their practices by offering an interpretive framework by which the teachers made sense of their actions and of the consequences these had for the students. In a similar vein, conceiving of language teachers' cognitions as "conceptual and social resources they bring to their practice" (Scarino, 2013, p. 316), Scarino's study illuminated the role that the teachers' interpretative frameworks of knowledge, beliefs, and values played in the development of their language assessment literacy. In contrast, Büyükkarcı's (2014) study of teachers' beliefs regarding language assessment, elicited from the participants as abstract propositions, revealed an inconsequential role these played in shaping their actual assessment practices.

In this article, I pursue a conceptualization of language teacher cognition as embedded in, rather than separate from, practice with the aim to understand "how that which is hidden merges with and shapes that which is public" (Johnson, 1995, p. 7) and address the need to account for

the "discourse participants' complex and competing expectations and beliefs, identities and voices, and fears and anxieties" (Kumaravadivelu, 1999, p. 472) to gain a fuller understanding of how L2 development opportunities arise in language teachers' TLD. In other words, my objective does not concern how teachers' stated beliefs and knowledge may or may not be applied in their discursive practices (e.g., Li, 2013; Li & Walsh, 2011). Instead, I wish to seek an understanding of teachers' *inner landscapes of action*, that is, those interpretive frameworks of inner resources that language teachers draw upon as they engage in and make sense of their interactions with students in TLD.

<A> THE STUDY

<B> The Research Participant and Data Collection

This study is part of a larger longitudinal ethnographic project investigating conceptual change of eight English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers in XXXX who participated in a yearlong teacher development (TD) programme aimed at helping teachers understand the strategies for creating motivating environments in their language classrooms (Author, XXXX). Central to this article is *one* of the eight research participants, Tamara (pseudonym), a fully qualified experienced EFL teacher at a state secondary school (11-18 year-old students) where English was one of the school subjects and was taught up to three times per week in 45-minute lessons. Tamara was bilingual and shared the mother tongue (XXXX) with her students.

The database comes from a corpus of Tamara's data which were collected over the period of one school year (September 2004 - June 2005) and include: a) transcripts of audiorecordings and ethnographic field notes from *eight lesson observations*, b) *four in-depth interviews* exploring Tamara's professional and personal history, her interpretations of the TD course input,

and issues arising in lesson observations, c) *ethnographic field notes from six visits to Tamara's school* containing descriptive data about the teaching context and documenting Tamara's activities in this setting, including her informal interactions with colleagues and students, and d) *ethnographic field notes from the TD course sessions* which Tamara attended capturing what transpired in each session and documenting course her and other participants' interactions, their contributions to the sessions and their engagement with the TD course material.

<B> Data Analysis

Two analytical approaches have been combined in this study: a CA-informed approach to the analysis of TLD data from Tamara's observed lessons and a grounded theory ethnographic approach to the analysis of Tamara's ethnographic data.

The former approach has been adopted in order to understand the moment-by-moment unfolding of Tamara's TLD and to identify language learning opportunities for her students created through Tamara's use of language. As an initial organising framework, I adopted Walsh's (2006) framework for analysing classroom interaction which acknowledges the situated nature of classroom discourse and assumes that different interactional patterns are appropriate in different instructional "modes", defined as L2 classroom microcontexts with "clearly defined pedagogic goal[s] and distinctive interactional features determined largely by a teacher's use of language" (Walsh, 2006, pp. 62-63). I examined a range of interactional features in Tamara's classroom discourse, such as IRF patterns, display vs. referential questions, extended teacher turns, feedback, clarification requests, or confirmation checks and sought to establish the extent to which these adhered to the pedagogic goals of a given "mode" and thus, as is assumed by Walsh, contributed to the construction of learning opportunities. Extending Walsh's (2006) approach and drawing on elements of CA[1], which, as Kasper (2006) maintains, has the "capacity

to examine in detail how opportunities for L2 learning arise in interactional activities" (p. 83), I was further interested to establish how participants, and the teacher in particular, oriented to these interactional situations and what they themselves came to treat as learning opportunity (Kasper, 2004; Lee, 2013; Waring, 2008). To this end, I subjected sample excerpts of Tamara's TLD data across interactional modes to a fine-grained analysis of how each turn was produced and received by all discourse participants by paying attention to turn construction, word choice, pause, and the like (cf. ten Have, 2007).

In addition to the TLD data, I examined the sources of ethnographic data to understand what shaped Tamara's discursive behaviours and the learning opportunities that arose as a result. To this end, I adopted grounded theory ethnography (Charmaz, 2006), a qualitative approach to data collection and analysis, which shares some key features with ethnography, including a prolonged engagement in the field, gathering data through observation and in-depth interviewing, integration of multiple points of view, orientation to participants' perspectives, and attention to participants' use of language. However, rather than focusing primarily on cultural descriptions typical in ethnography, grounded theory ethnography is concerned with a conceptual understanding of phenomena or processes occurring in the particular context.

I examined the ethnographic data holistically for what it could reveal about Tamara's inner resources, which have traditionally been labelled as *language teacher cognition*. However, I depart from the typical approaches to researching teacher cognition (cf. Borg, 2012) which have tended to portray cognitive processes as something which research participants simply report. My aim, instead, was to construct a grounded theory of the invisible dimension of Tamara's discursive practices in the classroom by examining how her "cognitions" were embodied in her descriptions of everyday experiences and events (Heritage, 2005), including her

reflections on specific lessons, teaching methods, students, relevant educational policies, past personal and professional experiences, and perceived future challenges and plans.

Equally, I was interested to understand how the different settings and power dynamics (e.g., interviews with the researcher, conversations with colleagues, or informal interactions with students) may have shaped what, how, and why Tamara chose to engage with particular ideas, descriptions, and reflections and what light these could shed on her "inherent theories-in-use" (ten Have, 2007, p. 31), goals, and purposes guiding her TLD practices in the classroom.

I analysed the ethnographic data iteratively, generating larger and more abstract concepts out of a set of initially identified recurrent themes, interrogating the relationships between them, and moving back and forth between data and existing theories in the fields of applied linguistics, teacher education, and psychology to generate theoretical explanations for the emerging empirical insights. It was through this analytical process aided with the qualitative data analysis software NVivo (for a fuller description, see Author, XXXX) that the following constructs have been identified as relevant to the current discussion: Tamara's enacted beliefs about TLD as a site for L2 learning, which were grounded in her overarching future-oriented identity-related cognitions, namely the visions of the teacher she was striving to become, previously conceptualised as *ideal* and *ought-to language teacher selves* (Kubanyiova, 2009).

<A> TRACING OPPORTUNITIES FOR L2 DEVELOPMENT IN TAMARA'S TLD

The excerpt selected for the purposes of this article demonstrates features representative of Tamara's discursive behaviours displayed throughout the eight observations and across interactional microcontexts (cf. Walsh, 2006) within the same lessons. The lesson in question was Tamara's first observation in this research project. The classroom was arranged in rows of

desks, each designed to seat two students and there were 15 students in this class who had been taught by Tamara for four years. The coursebook theme that the class had been working on since the previous lesson was *friendship* and the students had been asked to write an "opinion piece", answering three questions related to the topic set by the teacher in the previous lesson and bring it to the following one, which is the subject of this analysis. The teacher began the class by referring to the homework, revising the three questions for the opinion paper and initiating a 5-min group discussion asking the students to share their ideas in small groups while she put on some music. Excerpt 1 (see Appendix for transcription conventions) begins with the end of the small group discussion when Tamara initiates a whole-class interaction.

EXCERPT 1

Whole-Class Discussion in Tamara's Class

(06) T: Thank you very much for (.) for (.) the discussion. ((some noise is still audible as the students finish their task)). Have you finished? (.) ((a few students are nodding)). Yes. I would like to ask now (.) someone who has all the answers in a kind of opinion paper, as a summary. As a summary, as a profile ((chatting stops, the whole class pays attention now)) of a ((inaudible)) ehm that means to you, that you should never do (.) ehm (.) I mean (.) ((in a quieter voice, to the groups in the front rows)) what was the second question?

(07) S: How do you imagine your friend =

(08) T: = imagination of a real friend. Fine. The imagination of ehm probably the appearance. Okay. So somebody who particularly cares about the appearance of their friend (.) Do you agree or not? (2)

(09) Ss: Uhm

(10) T: Young people particularly CARE about the appearance of their friends.

(11) S: It's stupid. ((to herself, not audible to whole class, but T hears it and reacts to it))

(12) T: It's stupid. But does it exist?

(13) Ss: yes/((inaudible))/((inaudible)).

(14) T: In what kind of age? Or in what situation?

(15) Ss: seventeen/ eighteen/ teenagers

(16) T: usually TEENAGERS! RIGHT! Er. Who? (1) Which sex let's say (.) ehm (.) girls or boys (.) have the intention to [find someone]=

(17) S: [Boys]

(18) T: =looking like ((inaudible))=

(19) Ss: =Boys!

(20) T: BOYS do? ((surprised))

(21) Ss: Yeah ((with determination)).

(22) T: I don't think =

(23) S: =cause boys want to be cool! ((All students laugh))

(24) T: ((over the laughter)) Boys want to be cool ((with uncertainty in her voice; students continue laughing as T speaks and making private remarks mostly in L1 related to the statement; inaudible)). Right. So we shall make a poll er across our corridor then (.) to check it out (.) to see whether it's right or not. But ehm as we did this survey so many times before, it's clear that girls do. Especially the YOUNG ones! If (.) if (.) I don't know (.) If the most popular girl in the class has a piercing (.)

(25) S: Everybody wants piercing ((the other students make private on-task comments in both L1 and L2, inaudible, laughter))

(26) T: And why (.) if all the other girls want to be as popular as she is, they also want the piercing!

(27) Ss: (inaudible)

(28) T: Anyway. Tell us what you think, tell us your answers. ((the rest of this turn is said in a quieter voice)) There's nothing to be afraid of. (1) You need to express yourself and now you have the opportunity. (3) ((the students nominate their classmate to read her essay to the whole class, the teacher confirms the choice and the student reads her essay aloud))

<B> Opportunities for 'Genuine Communication': From Tensions to Transformations

The pedagogical purposes of the interactional exchange in Excerpt 1 are initially somewhat ambiguous as Tamara appears to be concerned, if only very briefly, with checking or displaying students' "answers" (6), suggesting pedagogical goals typically associated with what Walsh (2006) has termed "materials mode". However, Tamara's review of the homework questions, particularly the second one, a reminder of which is offered by a student in turn 7, seems to trigger a seamless transformation from what may have begun as an intended homework check (and what, as turn 28 shows, in fact ends with it) into a meaning-oriented whole class discussion, resembling a "classroom context mode".

This transition can be seen in turn 8, in which Tamara responds to the student's clue with a slight reformulation of the question, concluded with an affirmative "fine". She then offers her own somewhat hesitant interpretation of its meaning ("the imagination of ehm probably the appearance"), followed by an affirmative "okay" and a further elaboration on her initial interpretation of the meaning of this question. Judging from their position in Tamara's discourse, both "fine" and "okay" appear to function as facilitators of Tamara's thinking process since they are both followed by her own more nuanced interpretation of the question's possible meaning. This further corroborates the earlier hypothesis that some degree of Tamara's cognitive processing and transformation of pedagogical goals is in evidence in this stretch of discourse. A brief pause precedes what now appears as an unambiguous formal launch of the meaning-oriented discussion, opened by Tamara's yes/no question "do you agree or not?" at the end of turn 8, followed by another, more qualified statement ("young people particularly CARE…") in turn 10 after the original one failed to trigger a satisfactory response from the students.

Although Tamara's opening turns of this excerpt signal an initial struggle to establish a context for meaningful discussion, what follows in the remainder of this transcript features a number of interactional patterns associated with classroom context mode, whose typical pedagogical purposes include enabling learners to express their opinions or share experiences, activating their mental schemata, establishing a context, or promoting oral fluency practice (cf. Walsh, 2006, p. 66). Just a cursory glance at TLD in Excerpt 1 reveals immediately recognisable interactional features of this mode, including content feedback (12, 16, 22, 24), referential questions (08, 12, 14, 16), a confirmation check (20), and, overall, frequent student involvement and an exclusive focus on meaning with minimal (in this case a complete absence of) repair.

However, employing a more emic (Seedhouse, 2007) CA-informed approach to the analysis of the unfolding moment-by-moment interaction in this segment reveals intriguing differences between the teacher's and the students' orientations to this interactional situation and what may initially appear as classroom context mode only functions as one depending on whose orientations are considered and at which point in the interaction. A close inspection reveals that although some of the specific interactional features of Excerpt 1 correspond with those in the classroom context mode at a surface level, they acquire a significantly different meaning for the participants in the particular interactional sequence when examined from a more insider perspective.

The first feature worth noticing is the nature of students' involvement. Although students' turns are frequent, most of them are brief, typically one-word responses to Tamara's questions, and many in fact remain private (09, 11, 13, 15, 27; marked by a dashed underline), that is, uttered by the students, sometimes simultaneously, more to themselves than with the intention to participate in public TLD. Whether or not they are promoted to the public status

seems to be completely in the hands of the teacher (at least until turn 19 to which I will return later) who selectively engages with those private contributions which are within her earshot and, at the same time, are judged by Tamara to have the potential to extend the discussion in ways that converge with her goals for the exchange. Two examples which illuminate just what those goals could be can be found around turns 12 and 16 respectively, both demonstrating how the students' private speech is brought by Tamara into the public domain of TLD.

In the first example, a student reacts with a private remark ("it's stupid", 11) to Tamara's statement canvassing the group's opinions, clearly indicating his engagement with meaning. Possibly sensing an interesting opportunity for extending the discussion, Tamara, without hesitation, incorporates this into the public domain of TLD by repeating the idea and immediately building on it with a follow-up question ("But does it exist?", 12). Not only does this function as an implicit positive assessment and, consequently, since the conversation is exclusively meaning-oriented, endorsement of the opinion, but at the same time, effectively narrows down the possible directions of subsequent discussion: disagreeing with the original statement has now been officially eliminated from the possible options of students' views to be discussed in the public domain of TLD.

The second example of Tamara's inclusion of students' private contributions to the discussion immediately follows the first one. Since her initiation ("But does it exist?") in the previously attempted meaning-focused IRF sequence did not produce a student response which could be followed up in a meaningful way ("yes", 12), Tamara launches a set of two referential questions to scaffold students' participation in this discussion. The simultaneous private remarks of the students (15) suggest that the strategy has worked and Tamara's approval of the outcome is clearly demonstrated in her subsequent feedback which she directs at a contribution selected

from the pool of private student responses in a particularly emphatic, almost celebratory, positive evaluation ("usually TEENAGERS! RIGHT!", 16). Although Tamara's aim for this interaction may have been to expand the discussion to pursue her pedagogical goals, her emphatic positive assessment of the preferred response functions as a "closure"- rather than "expansion-relevant" turn (cf. Schegloff, 2007). This is confirmed by the fact that in order to keep the conversation moving, Tamara has no other option but to initiate a new interactional sequence, starting with what appears an open-ended question ("Who?") only to be reformulated after a brief pause into a closed question, offering the students clearly defined options to choose from ("girls or boys").

These two examples show that although the interactional features that Tamara is intuitively employing in these exchanges may on surface correspond with those in the classroom context mode, a wholly different picture emerges when the focus is on what Tamara is in fact doing. Far from taking a back seat and enabling students to express their opinions and experiences (cf. Walsh, 2006), the excerpt reveals a carefully-orchestrated gradual narrowing down of the conversational terrain, allowing Tamara's control over the kinds of ideas that the terrain will yield. In sum, Tamara does not seem to orient to this interactional situation as an opportunity for students to express their diverse views on friendship, but, rather, it appears, as her chance to bring them to a preferred path, some kind of a 'correct answer'. When the students start insisting on one that diverges from this path (17-21), a dramatic shift occurs in the course of TLD, a discussion of which I will return to shortly.

In this context, then, the questions initially deemed as referential acquire a new quality: they appear to be asked with the purpose to lead the discussion in pre-determined rather than open-ended directions and this 'display' function is in clear tension with the established pedagogical purposes for this interactional microcontext. Similarly, although the third discursive

move (F) of the IRF triadic exchange can and has been used to encourage students' explanation, elaboration or extension of their ideas in TLD (Consolo, 2000; Duff, 2000; Hall & Walsh, 2002; Nassaji & Wells, 2000; Park, 2014), in other words, to enact the pedagogical goals of classroom context mode, Tamara's exclusive focus in this turn on carving out a carefully delineated conversational channel appears to preclude students' engagement in such discursive behaviours. Interestingly, the students, as "competent members of classroom interactional activities" (Hall, 2010, p. 206) seem to be well socialised into this latent orientation and even though they are clearly cognitively engaged in meaning making in this stretch of TLD, they offer little more than one-word, mostly private, responses, allowing the teacher to select, evaluate, and build on those that fit in with this underlying agenda.

As has already been suggested, this changes dramatically when the students come up with an answer which appears to deviate from the TLD pathway pursued by Tamara. A student's overlapped response in 17 ("Boys") at first goes unnoticed as Tamara continues to elaborate on her question. However, undeterred by the teacher's unfinished turn, the students join forces and, in stark contrast with their earlier discursive behaviour, collectively and publicly demand Tamara's attention to their classmate's previous contribution by repeating it in unison ("Boys!", 19), not only interrupting Tamara's turn, but also disrupting the IRF pattern that Tamara is employing in order to manage this interactional space. It is at this point in the interaction that striking differences can be discerned between the teacher's and the students' orientations to this interactional exchange.

The students clearly interpret Tamara's surprised question in 20 as a meaning-related confirmation check (and thus her engagement with their line of reasoning) and go on to confirm their stance in the subsequent turn ("Yeah", 21). Although Tamara attempts a negative

assessment and begins to articulate her disagreement with the opinion in 22 ("I don't think"), the IRF routine that she is attempting to restore is disrupted once again in an extraordinary turn of events when a student interrupts her by offering an unsolicited public justification of the previously articulated opinion ("Cause boys want to be cool!"). This uninvited and, at the same time, the longest and most elaborate student contribution so far in this excerpt, results in the engagement of the whole class, evidenced by their affective response (laughter in 23, 24), but also further meaning-focused comments, public (25) as well as private (24, 27). There is no doubt, therefore, of an alignment of the students' orientation to this interactional sequence with the pedagogical purposes of classroom context mode: they engage with meaning, express opinions, and extend their views and, remarkably, they do so even when such discursive behaviours are not only uncalled for, but are in fact deliberately curbed (cf. Garton, 2012; Jacknick, 2011). Under what circumstances students exercise their agency in this way and when they choose not to could prove an interesting line of inquiry in future research on TLD.

Interestingly, the shifting orientation of the students in this part of interaction seems to do little to affect Tamara's purposes, which, as was shown in the earlier analysis, proved to be in tension with the pedagogical goals of classroom context mode. In fact, the discrepancy becomes even more pronounced and Tamara's orientation to this interaction far less ambiguous as soon as the IRF structure which previously enabled her to shape TLD in desired directions seems beyond repair. Instead of freeing up the conversational space that would allow the students to continue their engagement in meaning making and thus pursue the goals integral to this interactional mode, Tamara tightens her interactional 'grip' and steers the discussion back 'on track'. Having been stripped of the interactional possibilities afforded by the now dismantled IRF structure, TLD offers one more strategy which Tamara firmly holds on to: an extended turn which allows

her to reveal what the 'correct' answer should have been. And even though the students continue to be engaged, their response to the pause at the end of 25 which they interpret (incorrectly, it turns out) as an invitation to express their views and their private remarks in 27 go unacknowledged before Tamara returns from this 'interactional detour' to what appeared to be her rationale at the outset of this excerpt: to check the students' homework "answers" (28).

<B> Summary

This excerpt of TLD has shown that Tamara's use of interactional strategies did not match the originally assumed pedagogic purposes of the interaction. The use of IRF sequencing, for instance, appears to function as a tool for exerting control over the discourse even though such control is not warranted by the given "mode" and in fact restricts opportunities for L2 development that may have otherwise become available to the students.

Yet, given the recurring tendency of Tamara's discursive patterns throughout her interactional data and across interactional microcontexts (space limitations do not allow discussing more than one sample excerpt), it seems that what is at play in this teacher's talk is much more than random, let alone accidental, mixing of different interactional modes (cf. Walsh, 2006): the underlying coherence that has emerged through Tamara's TLD data suggests that in order to understand the ecology of L2 learning opportunities, it may be necessary to look beyond interactional microcontexts and pedagogical goals in order to establish what shapes the "interaction engine" (Levinson, 2006) in Tamara's TLD. The aim of the analysis presented in the next section is to shed light on the unobservable dimension of Tamara's discursive behaviours by discussing three sets of overarching desires which appeared to guide her interactional practices.

<A> UNEARTHING THE 'HIDDEN ENGINE' OF THE INTERACTIONAL DESIGN OF TAMARA'S TLD

Tamara's immediate unsolicited post-observation comment on the lesson from which Excerpt 1 comes confirms the earlier conclusion that some sort of transformation, or "change" of "plan", was in evidence during the actual lesson. Tamara's reaction as we were walking down the corridor to the staffroom immediately after the lesson makes this very explicit[2]:

> I changed my plan in the second part of the lesson. There were some grammatical exercises that followed, but based on the nice discussion, I didn't want to interrupt it, so I chose another task from the coursebook, not the one I'd planned on phrasal verbs.

Apart from evidence of Tamara's reflection-in-action (Schön, 1983), resulting in the change of original plan as her response to the specific situation of the lesson, this account also hints at her positive assessment of "discussion" judged as a valuable (i.e., "nice") type of classroom practice for this particular setting. This seems to be put in contrast with "grammatical exercises", a planned instructional activity which was relegated, as a result of Tamara's decision-making process, to a peripheral position within this part of the lesson. The question worth addressing before investigating more fully the meaning, purposes, and intentions behind Tamara's discursive behaviours and pedagogical decisions concerns the nature of the situation to which Tamara was responding by her change of plan.

As has been noted earlier, Tamara's data come from her participation in a research project whose aims were to introduce a group of in-service EFL teachers to practical strategies for engaging students in the language classroom in a specially designed teacher development

(TD) course. Although no obligation was placed on the participating teachers to implement any of the TD course ideas into their teaching practice (their participation was entirely voluntary without any form of assessment involved), Tamara was one of the few who exerted, and explicitly admitted, conscious effort to incorporate what she saw as elements of the TD course input into her observed lessons and this has been well documented elsewhere (Author, XXXX). It may be reasonable to tentatively presume, therefore, that Tamara's desire to engage with the TD course material in her own teaching may have been one of the key platforms against which her decisions about what to include in the observed lessons or, in contrast, exclude from them have been judged.

The plausibility and the implications of this hypothesis will be examined further against a backdrop of Tamara's more elaborate post-observation interview (Excerpt 2) in which she was prompted to reflect on the observed lesson more fully. The remainder of this analysis will draw on this excerpt as well as additional excerpts from the ethnographic data to demonstrate how the interplay of Tamara's desire to live up to the researcher's expectations, her beliefs about the pedagogical value of teacher-student interaction, and the image of the language teacher she was striving to become all contributed to the interaction 'engine' that fuelled the kinds of L2 development opportunities that Tamara actively pursued in her TLD and which, in contrast, she chose to curb.

EXCERPT 2

Tamara's Reflections on the Observed Lesson from Interview 1

I always plan my lessons in such a way, well, my aim is always to start communication among students themselves, not myself, not that I should be the communication channel between me and them, but rather [they should communicate] with each other, rather like, sharing information, sharing opinions, more concretely, question-answer-based discussion. However, we'd already had a preparation for this class, the three questions for homework to enable them to reflect on their own and try to write without any concrete outline a sort of opinion paper, which we will later learn how to write in the writing part of the unit, an opinion paper….. They were asked to simply use their experience to express their opinion. And we will then analyse what's an essay, what's a reflection, what's an opinion paper. Anyway, that's not what I wanted to say. When we did this friendship? The basis for our class was the topic as such and I always start with a few general questions, in terms of what they know about the topic, what it reminds them of, what they think we could discuss in our class in relation to it. And I always plan the lesson in this way. Either I only have an article plus a discussion and then grammar related to the article and then possibly some post-reading activities and grammar practice. Or, when possible, through that discussion, if I can pick up from the discussion something like, 'now you have used this particular sentence structure', and I can return to it. Well, this, the phrasal verbs, is something I didn't get to do in this particular lesson. It was just a homework check, to be honest, the only positive thing was that they exchanged information, they had to write, they know already how to share opinions within the group, they have to write notes and they can use this information in reproduction or their maturita [school leaving exam] question, because they do have one on friendship. They have the complete vocabulary, opinions, yes? So in this way they don't have to develop the topic any further [for the maturita exam]. Educational attitudes. It's more educational what you have seen.

INTERVIEWER

Is it a positive thing for you or do you feel that it was not a good class?

TAMARA

(silence) Well, as such, it was not really my idea. This should have been the beginning. In this class, it

was an end, the discussion. So it didn't have any particular rationale. And this is what would bother me in my classes. I always want to make sure that each class works as a unit, it's got to have head and tail…. What we did was a sort of post-activity. I don't know.

<B> Desire to Please: The Role of Ought-to Language Teacher Selves

An immediately striking feature of Tamara's reflection in Excerpt 2 is her development of the meanings that she attached to "discussion", by which she refers to the interactional sequence shown in Excerpt 1. Initially, her conceptualisation appears to correspond with the notion of teacher-student interaction in classroom context mode (Walsh, 2006) and its pedagogical goals of "sharing information, sharing opinions" (03). Crucially for this analysis, it also suggests a degree of Tamara's cognitive engagement with the broader themes of the TD course, which included principles for engaging students in meaningful communication, introducing personally-relevant topics and tasks, and promoting group responsibility for classroom interaction (e.g., increased wait time, promoting the norms of listening to each other and collaboration). This is verbally hinted at in her emphasis on interaction "among students themselves, not myself" (01-02) as well as in her final remark of Excerpt 1 "You need to express yourself and now you have the opportunity" (28).

It would appear, however, that these are somewhat vague and abstract notions, being implicitly acknowledged by Tamara as such, and as soon as she begins to elaborate "more concretely" (03-04) and to draw on what she clearly views as her successful past experience of incorporating this type of interactional strategy into her lessons (04-15), two crucial insights emerge: first, the meaning that Tamara now associates with effective whole class "question-answer-based discussion" (04) has shifted significantly from her initial articulation and this new meaning will be inspected more closely in the next section. The second insight concerns

Tamara's open acknowledgement that what she ended up doing in the observed class was a different kind of "discussion" which did not meet her requirements for effective teaching and therefore failed to produce outcomes that she would typically expect to achieve in her lessons (16; 25-28).

In other words, despite Tamara's initial positive appraisal of the "nice discussion" that she "didn't want to interrupt" and therefore "changed" her original lesson "plan", quite a contrasting emotional appraisal emerges as her reflection unfolds in this interview: Tamara's frustration with this practice in the context of the observed lesson (15 onwards). Although "the only positive thing" (16) grows into a fairly long list of benefits (16-20) that she appears to have generated in the effort to give a certain "educational" (20-21) meaning to a strategy which would otherwise be a little more than "a homework check, to be honest" (16), in her mind the benefits do not seem to override the fact that this was "not really my idea" (25) of a good class and to have to do this would in fact "bother me in my classes" (26-27).

So how are we to understand the contradictions in Tamara's messages and the accompanying emotional tensions in her appraisal of her own teaching? And, if "not really [her] idea", whose "idea" was Tamara attempting to pursue in her observed lesson as well as, it would appear, in the initial stages of her post-observation reflection, and to what end? The answer to these questions becomes clearer when the research context in which Tamara was participating is conceptualized as an "interactional event" (Talmy & Richards, 2011, p. 2) and in addition to examining the content of what Tamara was saying, this inquiry extends to what she was doing, that is, which aspect of the context and her professional identity (in this case, a committed research participant versus an experienced and competent English language teacher) she was

making relevant in the moment-by-moment unfolding of the research interview as well as classroom TLD.

Viewed from this perspective, Tamara's initial conceptualisation of "discussion" in Excerpt 3 now appears to be associated with the former context in which she primarily drew on her role in the research project. As a highly responsible research participant who had known the researcher prior to the project (cf. Author, XXXX), she seems to have taken it upon herself, as some sort of unspoken obligation, to engage with the TD course ideas by "show[ing] you" something "non-standard" (Interview 3). As a result, Tamara appears to have planned, delivered, and talked about her observed lessons in ways which, although going well beyond her comfort zone, allowed the researcher to "see" (21) examples of what she imagined as desirable behaviours and/or attitudes. In short, the 'hidden engine' of Tamara's interactions seems to be partly fuelled by her desire to please, guided by her less internalised visual self guide, previously conceptualized as *Ought-to Language Teacher Self* (Kubanyiova, 2009). Interestingly, as soon as Tamara's professional identity as an expert language teacher is invoked by the interactional context of the interview (e.g., when she draws on her past successful experience in 09-15, or when she is invited to make a professional judgment in 23), a very different but far more concrete and detailed image of what counts as good teaching surfaces from Tamara's account.

It seems, therefore, that what may appear as contradictions in Tamara's account merely reflect a dynamic nature of this interactional event in which Tamara's different identities with accompanying, and, in this case, distinctive images of good practice, become relevant as the interaction unfolds. Tamara's concluding statement "I don't know" (28) following an articulate and confident assessment of her practice leaves open the possibility of returning to her pursuit of her Ought-to Language Teacher Self, enabling us to view this interactional event as a dynamic

and contingent space in which a range of participants' social pursuits become relevant at different times.

Applying this analytical insight to address the central aim of this study, it can be concluded that in addition to any pedagogical goals that may have governed Tamara's use of language in TLD, another significant subset of social and identity-related goals appears to have been at play: Tamara's desire to please. In fact, the shifts that were evident in her conceptualisation of "discussion" in Excerpt 3 bear strong resemblance with the 'interactional detour' from her intended homework check traced in her TLD in Excerpt 1 and these are, intriguingly, in line with a general 'detour' tendency fuelled by Tamara's Ought-to Language Teacher Self in her overall engagement with the TD course (Author, XXXX, p. X). Because Tamara had clearly not identified with the ought-to image of good teaching that she attempted to pursue in her classroom out of her desire to please, she may not have been fully attuned to and, as a result, not exploited the potential for students' L2 development that the attempted practices may have offered.

In order to pursue this line of inquiry further and appreciate more fully how this unobservable dimension of Tamara's teaching contributed to the ecology of L2 development opportunities in her classroom, it is crucial to establish what her 'ought-to detour' was from, or, in other words, what Tamara's original pedagogical 'route' was intended to achieve.

<B> Desire to 'Teach': Beliefs about Interaction as a Springboard to the 'Real Thing'

Tamara begins her "more concrete" (04) operationalization of "discussion" by setting it in a larger context of the syllabus for this class. She recounts what the students did prior to the observed class and what purposes such preparation served (04-8): "they were asked to simply use

their experience to express their opinion" (07), which was intended as a springboard for the unit's core writing skills objective: learning how to write "an opinion paper" (08). This brief contextualisation already carries crucial hints into the possible original uses of Tamara's oral whole-class elicitation and these are further explored below.

The pedagogical goals for the "question-answer-based discussion" (04) that Tamara would "always" (09) employ seem to include the principal pedagogic goals of classroom context mode (Walsh, 2006, p. 79), such as introducing a new topic or activating students' mental schemata (10-11). Yet, a closer inspection of Tamara's reasoning in this excerpt (12-15) as well as across her ethnographic dataset clearly foregrounds a pedagogical function that differs from such goals in Tamara's typical instructional practice: students' L2 output, whether this is elicited through a written homework task or in a whole-class meaning-focused TLD, seems to serve as a means to a more central pedagogical end. It would appear, then, that Tamara may not see "discussion" as a site where L2 development occurs, but rather, as a springboard to the 'real thing' (my term), that is, the actual L2 teaching and learning.

Evidence of such beliefs abounds across Tamara's dataset. She talks about teacher-student interaction as some kind of "post-activity" (28) or, in contrast, an ingredient which helps to "start [the students] off" and "tune into English after holidays" (Interview 3), but which is otherwise not essential for language learning and doesn't have "any particular rationale" (26), unless it can serve another, more substantial pedagogical purpose, such as revision of "relative clauses" (Interview 3) or presenting a new material on "phrasal verbs" (15). Instead of orienting to teacher-student discussion as "genuine communication" (Walsh, 2006, p. 79), then, Tamara appears to primarily employ it as a classroom organization tool which allows her to pace the lesson and link the core teaching activities within it, but, contrary to research and theorizing in

SLA, not as a "vehicle" for second language learning (Mackey, 2007a, p. 2). And although there may be certain "educational" (20-21) benefits to teacher-student interaction if it is employed in its own right, "pure speaking" (Interview 4) is, in Tamara's mind, not where real teaching and, by extension, learning takes place.

Through the lens of these beliefs, Tamara's discursive behaviours in Excerpt 1 acquire new coherence and integrity. Although she may have skilfully borrowed from interactional features of classroom context mode, her primary pedagogical goal for this stretch of TLD was to craft an effective transitional space which would allow her to get on with what she saw as the actual teaching, in this case, the exercises concerning "phrasal verbs" (15). Naturally, then, because she did not believe that her "discussion" with the students had the potential to offer anything other than effective links to the main objective of the lesson and, therefore, the intended primary source of students' language learning, she did not orient to the students' contributions during TLD as L2 development opportunities, even though the TLD data discussed in the previous section of this analysis may have revealed such potential. It appears, however, that Tamara's desire to "teach" (the phrasal verbs) may have collided with her other, externally driven, desire to please. As a result, the pedagogical links she would have normally crafted with ease, did not become available in this instance of TLD, leading to Tamara's negative emotional appraisal of her efforts (25-8).

<B> Desire to Lead: Ideal Language Teacher Self as the Central Source of Tamara's Discursive Behaviours

The insights into Tamara's image of her ought-to self and her beliefs about what interaction can and cannot achieve in the language classroom have shed considerable explanatory light on her orientation to students' learning in her TLD. However, a closer inquiry into the underlying

coherence of Tamara's discursive behaviour across interactional modes suggests an even more powerful overarching hidden dimension that seems to permeate all aspects of Tamara's praxis: Tamara's pursuit of her vivid and deeply cherished vision of what it means to be an effective language teacher, in others words, her Ideal Language Teacher Self.

Far from being restricted to the TLD episodes discussed in this paper, the themes of *control*, *authority*, *dominance*, and *leadership* strongly resonated across Tamara's dataset. In her reflections about what brought her into the teaching profession, Tamara was clear that she had always wished to become a teacher, even though the decision about the subject she would specialise in may have come later. What she liked about being a teacher was the "feeling that I am important to them [the students] at that moment" (Interview 1). On systematic inspection of the full dataset, this statement proved to be an eloquent statement portraying Tamara's vision of the teacher she was striving to become, that is, her Ideal Language Teacher Self.

In the classroom, she took on almost all leadership roles and assumed responsibility for most aspects of the classroom life, including pedagogical, linguistic, logistical, and discipline-related. Admittedly, adopting such roles is fully expected of the teacher across diverse instructional microcontexts of the language classroom. However, it was a frequent occurrence of Tamara's exercise of leadership in less predictable settings, such as ratifying students' answers and adopting a role of "primary knower" (Berry, 1981, cited in Nassaji & Wells, 2000) in meaning-focused interactions or assuming a role of organiser and orchestrator of activities which explicitly called for students' involvement in such roles, which led to a crucial analytical 'hunch': Tamara's desire to lead was integral to her deeply internalised image of a good language teacher, which shaped her behaviours across interactional microcontexts.

This insight was reinforced across Tamara's reflections in interviews and post-observation comments. She talked about herself as someone who "must have intro, body, conclusion", whose rigorously structured lessons must "flow well", and who "makes few mistakes", or at least "tries not to make them often" because "that would mean that I am not prepared properly, or I don't have the qualities I should have in order to teach well" (Interview 3). Whenever she perceived her 'ought-to'-driven efforts during the observed lessons as unsuccessful, she would reason that she was, after all, a "grammar person" who "feel[s] most comfortable explaining grammar" (post-observation interview) and who "find[s] grammar activities much much easier than other stuff" because the students are "not able to do role-plays really" (post-observation interview).

At first glance, this preference appears unrelated to Tamara's desire to lead as the main ingredient of her Ideal Language Teacher Self. However, the striking absence of any evidence of students' actual preferences even if these were often called upon as her rationale for specific pedagogical choices (cf. Author, XXXX) and a close examination of Tamara's actual grammar teaching practices whenever she did incorporate these into her observed lessons (typically involving either long-turn explanation of grammatical rules or tightly controlled IRF sequences aimed at checking students' metalinguistic awareness) suggest otherwise. Tamara's emphasis on grammar may not have reflected a belief about what students needed to know and how they learned best, but rather an ideal setting which allowed Tamara to pursue her desire to lead and thus enact her vision of Ideal Language Teacher Self. Tamara's concluding comments on the observed lesson at the heart of the present study (Interview 1) paints a vivid portrait of all three dimensions of the 'hidden interaction engine' of Tamara's classroom behaviours, with her vivid and deeply internalised vision of Ideal Language Teacher Self at its core.

> Homework check was at the beginning, information exchange. Then the association phase, we were looking for similarities between their opinions and the article. Opinions on friendship, he/she should be loyal. And then we were back to the original article, what I needed, because then I could connect it to another activity. There were 16 new verbs, they were asked to find them, find equivalents of full meaning words, this was nicely done, practiced in sentences, so from that article I moved to grammar.

And so while the analysis of the 'hidden engine' of Tamara's discursive behaviours in Excerpt 1 revealed important insight into the original pedagogical goal of Tamara's TLD (i.e., not a context for fostering genuine communication but rather a tool for managing transition), it now appears that the control element which permeated Tamara's TLD data across interactional modes point to a more overarching and pervasive tendency of Tamara's desire to be in charge. Such desire seems to clearly correspond with Tamara's deeply internalised image of an effective teacher, a future-oriented self-guide, with an inherently moral content regarding what teachers and language teaching are for. Not only did the notion of interaction as a vehicle for L2 development clash with Tamara's beliefs about language learning, but, more crucially, it went against, and often threatened, her Ideal Language Teacher Self whenever she lost ownership and control of the knowledge being generated through this type of "discussion."

<A> DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

By connecting research concerns of SLA and language teacher cognition in a single study, this research has made several significant contributions to applied linguistics. First, in line with past

theorizing, it has confirmed TLD as a powerful interactional space in which opportunities for students' meaningful participation in classroom discourse and, by extension, for their L2 development can arise. Tamara's data have laid bare intriguing openings in TLD for her students' involvement in authentic L2 conversation. This study has shown, however, that the extent to which language teachers orient to such openings as learning opportunities and transform the potential into the language learning reality for their students depends on the interpretive frameworks of inner resources that they bring into this interaction.

The second contribution is in detailing the nature of these interpretive frameworks and in foregrounding those that have been found consequential to students' L2 development opportunities in TLD. The data in this article have confirmed that teachers' discursive behaviours are goal-oriented and this is true even if they may at first sight appear to be no more than a random mixing of interactional modes (cf. Walsh, 2006). Their purpose, however, does not seem to be driven solely, and sometimes not even primarily, by pedagogical concerns but rather by a dynamic interplay of pedagogical, social, and identity-relevant pursuits, central among which are teachers' future self-guides. Tamara's 'hidden interactional engine' was clearly fuelled by pedagogical considerations (to manage a transition to the main focus of the lesson) guided by her beliefs about the instructional value of interaction (not as a site for L2 development, but rather as a tool for managing transitions). However, an additional layer of inquiry into her discursive intentions within the current excerpts as well as across her dataset has revealed that these pedagogical concerns were firmly rooted in an overarching dimension of Tamara's vision of the kind of language teacher she was striving to become.

It has been documented in this study and elsewhere (Dörnyei & Kubanyiova, 2014; Hamman et al., 2013; Hiver, 2013; Horn, Nolen, Ward, & Campbell, 2008; Kubanyiova, 2012;

Kumazawa, 2013; Ronfeldt & Grossman, 2008) that these desired future self-guides, conceptualised in the language teaching literature as *language teachers' possible selves* (Kubanyiova, 2009), fuel and find expression in action, are inextricably linked with emotions, and contain an inherent moral dimension; that is, they provide clues into the broader values concerning what teachers are for, what kind of learning environments they should strive to create for their students, and what purposes language education should serve.

Conceptually, the construct of *language teachers' possible selves* is not dissimilar from Clandinin's (1986) concept of *image* as a personal organising framework within teachers' personal practical knowledge through which they interpret and reconstruct their experience (Feryok, 2012; Feryok & Pryde, 2012) and which encompasses their affective and moral ways of knowing (Golombek, 1998). The key distinctive theoretical contribution of language teachers' possible selves and their explanatory power in the context of this study, however, lies in foregrounding the central role that teachers' *future-oriented identity-relevant investment* in those images play in guiding their action. This study has shown that language teachers may have to negotiate multiple images of desired future selves, which may be shaped by their past experiences, imposed by the wider contexts of their teaching worlds, or evoked by specific interactional events, such as participation in research. The extent to which these become guides of teachers' actions and what consequences these have for students' learning is contingent upon the specific social situation in which these images become salient, the degree of teachers' self-identification with them, and the actual content they carry (cf. Kubanyiova, 2012).

These findings are a critical step towards addressing the question of "what types of professional development opportunities are needed to transform teacher discourse" (Thoms, 2012, p. s21). There has been a general assumption that greater awareness of relevant discourse

features will lead to improved practice (e.g., Consolo, 2000; Walsh, 2006) and a wide range of useful resources have been produced for language teachers with this aim in mind (Walsh, 2013; Wong & Waring, 2010). This study, along with previous theorizing on language teachers' development (Author, XXXX), has brought new insights into this assumption.

Tamara's image of her ideal language teacher self as a well-organised and highly competent language educator who is in full charge of the teaching process and a 'primary knower' in her interaction with the students clearly clashed with some of the pedagogical objectives of classroom context mode; it did not allow her to take a back seat and create an interactional space in which her students could invest themselves in the classroom conversation in ways that have been suggested as beneficial in past research on TLD. The centrality of this deeply internalized vision of Tamara's desired self in her teaching life, however, suggests that in order for her to become more attuned to L2 development opportunities in her TLD, awareness-raising with regard to her use of language may not have made significant difference if the image of her desired teacher self remained intact. In other words, it may not have been primarily a training in classroom discourse strategies that was needed but a transformation of her vision.

It appears, therefore, that initiatives aimed at enabling language teachers to facilitate their students' learning in TLD must begin with opportunities on teacher education programmes, in teacher development groups, and in the school communities for articulating, reflecting on, and, if necessary, challenging teachers' images of a good teacher (cf. Dörnyei & Kubanyiova, 2014; Kubanyiova, 2014). Helping language teachers to engage more deeply with philosophies of teaching (Crookes, 2009) and ethical ways of knowing (Scarino, 2005) may be especially critical in contexts in which formal structures of teacher preparation are not supportive of such reflection (cf. Kubanyiova, 2006).

Finally, the findings of this study suggest that in order to reclaim the relevance of language teacher cognition domain and establish more firmly the relationship between "how teachers cognize" and what "effects their cognitions have on learning" (Ellis, 2009, p. 141), future research in this domain will need to extend the current concerns with what teachers think, know, and believe (Borg, 2006) to include questions about who language teachers in specific sociocultural contexts strive to become, what kind of learning environments they envisage for their students, and what impact these images of future selves have on what they do and what their students learn. Such questions will inevitably require a more prominent focus on the affective, imaginative, moral, and identity-related dimensions of language teachers' inner resources. As the studies across this guest-edited issue attest, possible selves is, of course, not the only construct capable of capturing the complexity of language teachers' inner lives. It is becoming increasingly clear, however, that in order to reclaim the relevance of our discipline to the real-world concerns of language teachers, language teacher educators, and policy makers, we need to embrace more inclusive rather than restrictive ways of talking about why language teachers do what they do and what consequences their actions have for what their students learn. Addressing such a relationship has been a perennially difficult issue in research on teaching (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2008; Freeman & Johnson, 2005; Tsui, 2012; Zeichner, 2005). By crossing the disciplinary boundaries between SLA and language teacher cognition, this study has pointed to a possible future direction which carries a promise to transform the frontiers of research and increase its relevance to those it is aimed to serve.

<A> NOTES

1 Combining CA with an ethnographic approach in a single study may present certain tensions arising from the incompatibility of the epistemological assumptions underlying each approach (cf. Ortega, 2009; although see Waring, Creider, Tarpey, & Black, 2012; Waring & Hruska, 2012). However, my ultimate analytical goal was to establish how the understanding gleaned from the two approaches could contribute to constructing the ecology of language learning in the classroom (van Lier, 2000) and inform the kind of teacher education interventions needed to help teachers harness opportunities for students' language learning available in TLD. These goals have informed the level of transcription of TLD and the detail of analysis (i.e., they are deemed sufficient for the purposes of this inquiry even though they, admittedly, do not fully adhere to established CA guidelines).

2 As opposed to TLD which was managed in L2 (unless stated otherwise), interviews were conducted in Tamara's L1 (XXXX) and have been loosely translated by the researcher/author to preserve Tamara's interactional style and the open-ended nature of her thinking aloud, including incompleteness or lack of coherence.

<A> REFERENCES

Barcelos, A. M. F., & Kalaja, P. (2011). Introduction to Beliefs about SLA revisited. *System, 39*, 281-289.

Basturkmen, H. (2012). Review of research into the correspondence between language teachers' stated beliefs and practices. *System, 40*, 282-295.

Batstone, R., & Philp, J. (2013). Classroom interaction and learning opportunities across time and space. In K. McDonough & A. Mackey (Eds.), *Second language interaction in diverse educational contexts* (pp. 109-125). Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. London: Continuum.

Borg, S. (2012). Current approaches to language teacher cognition research: A methodological analysis. In R. Barnard & A. Burns (Eds.), *Researching language teacher cognition and practice: International case studies* (pp. 11-29). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Breen, M. P., Hird, B., Milton, M., Oliver, R., & Thwaite, A. (2001). Making sense of language teaching: Teachers' principles and classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics, 22*, 470-501.

Büyükkarcı, K. (2014). Assessment beliefs and practices of language teachers in primary education. *International Journal of Instruction, 7*, 107-120.

Bygate, M. (2005). Applied linguistics: A pragmatic discipline, a generic discipline? *Applied Linguistics, 26*, 568-581.

Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London: Sage.

Clandinin, D. J. (1986). *Classroom practice: Teacher images in action*. London: Falmer Press.

Clifton, J. (2006). Facilitator talk. *ELT Journal, 60*, 142-150.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, K. (2008). Research on teacher education: Changing times, changing paradigms. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.),

Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts (3rd ed., pp. 1050-1093). New York: Routledge.

Consolo, D. A. (2000). Teachers' action and student oral participation in classroom interaction. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 91-107). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Crookes, G. (1997). SLA and language pedagogy. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*, 93-116.

Crookes, G. (2009). *Values, philosophies, and beliefs in TESOL: Making a statement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Donato, R. (2004). Aspects of collaboration in pedagogical discourse. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24*, 284-302.

Dörnyei, Z., & Kubanyiova, M. (2014). *Motivating learners, motivating teachers: Building vision in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Duff, P. A. (2000). Repetition in foreign language classroom interaction. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 109-138). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Eckerth, J. (2009). Negotiated interaction in the L2 classroom. *Language Teaching, 42*, 109-130.

Ellis, R. (2000). Task-based research and language pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research, 43*, 193-220.

Ellis, R. (2009). SLA and teacher education. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 135-143). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Feryok, A. (2012). Activity theory and language teacher agency. *Modern Language Journal, 90*, 95-107.

Feryok, A., & Pryde, M. (2012). Images as orienting activity: Using theory to inform classroom practices. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice, 18*, 441-454.

Freeman, D. (2002). The hidden side of the work: Teacher knowledge and learning to teach. *Language Teaching, 35*, 1-13.

Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. E. (2005). Towards linking teacher knowledge and student learning. In D. J. Tedick (Ed.), *Language teacher education: International perspectives on research and practice* (pp. 73-95). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Garton, S. (2012). Speaking out of turn? Taking the initiative in teacher-fronted classroom interaction. *Classroom Discourse, 3*, 29-45.

Gass, S., & Mackey, A. (2006). Input, interaction and output: An overview. *AILA Review, 19*, 3-17.

Golombek, P. R. (1998). A study of language teachers' personal practical knowledge. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*, 447-464.

Golombek, P. R. (2009). Personal practical knowledge in L2 teacher education. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 155-162). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Golombek, P. R., & Johnson, K. E. (2004). Narrative inquiry as a mediational space: Examining emotional and cognitive dissonance in second-language teachers' development. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice, 10*, 307-327.

Hall, J. K. (2010). Interaction as method and result of language learning. *Language Teaching, 43*, 202-215.

Hall, J. K., & Verplaetse, L. S. (Eds.). (2000). *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hall, J. K., & Walsh, M. (2002). Teacher-student interaction and language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22*, 186-203.

Hamman, D., Coward, F., Johnson, L., Lambert, M., Zhou, L., & Indiatsi, J. (2013). Teacher possible selves: How thinking about the future contributes to the formation of professional identity. *Self and Identity, 12*, 307-336.

Hellermann, J. (2003). The interactive work of prosody in the IRF exchange: Teacher repetition in feedback moves. *Language in Society, 32,* 79-104.

Hellermann, J., & Cole, E. (2009). Practices for social interaction in the language-learning classroom: Disengagements from dyadic task interaction. *Applied Linguistics, 30*, 186-215.

Heritage, J. (2005). Cognition in discourse. In H. Te Molder & J. Potter (Eds.), *Conversation and cognition* (pp. 184-202). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hiver, P. V. (2013). The interplay of possible language teacher selves in professional development choices. *Language Teaching Research, 17*, 210-227.

Horn, I. S., Nolen, S. B., Ward, C., & Campbell, S. S. (2008). Developing practices in multiple worlds: The role of identity in learning to teach. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 35*, 61-72.

Jacknick, C. M. (2011). Breaking in is hard to do: How students negotiate classroom activity shifts. *Classroom Discourse, 2*, 20-38.

Johnson, K. E. (1995). *Understanding communication in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kasper, G. (2004). Participant orientations in German conversation-for-learning. *Modern Language Journal, 88*, 551-567.

Kasper, G. (2006). Beyond repair: Conversation analysis as an approach to SLA. *AILA Review, 19*, 83-99.

Kayi-Aydar, H. (2013). Scaffolding language learning in an academic ESL classroom. *ELT Journal, 67*, 324-335.

Keck, C. M., Iberri-Shea, G., Tracy-Ventura, N., & Wa-Mbaleka, S. (2006). Investigating the empirical link between task-based interaction and acquisition. In J. M. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 91-131). Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ko, S. (2014). The nature of multiple responses to teachers' questions. *Applied Linguistics, 35*, 48-62.

Kubanyiova, M. (2006). Developing a motivational teaching practice in EFL teachers in Slovakia: Challenges of promoting teacher change in EFL contexts. *TESL-EJ, 10*(2), 1-17. Retrieved from http://www.tesl-ej.org/ej38/a5.pdf

Kubanyiova, M. (2009). Possible selves in language teacher development. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 Self* (pp. 314-332). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Kubanyiova, M. (2011, March). *Do teacher cognition and instructed SLA inhabit two parallel worlds? Proposing a new wave of language teacher cognition research.* Paper presented at the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Chicago, IL.

Kubanyiova, M. (2012). *Teacher development in action: Understanding language teachers' conceptual change*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kubanyiova, M. (2014). Motivating language teachers: Inspiring vision. In D. Lasagabaster, A. Doiz & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *Motivation and foreign language learning: From theory to practice* (pp. 71-89). Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999). Critical classroom discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*, 453-484.

Kumazawa, M. (2013). Gaps too large: Four novice EFL teachers' self-concept and motivation. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 33*, 45-55.

Lee, Y.-A. (2013). Descriptions of second language interaction: Toward descriptive adequacy. *Modern Language Journal, 97*, 853-868.

Levinson, S. C. (2006). On the human 'interaction engine'. In N. J. Enfield & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of human sociality: Culture, cognition and interaction* (pp. 39-69). Oxford: Berg.

Li, L. (2013). The complexity of language teachers' beliefs and practice: One EFL teacher's theories. *The Language Learning Journal, 41*, 175-191.

Li, L., & Walsh, S. (2011). 'Seeing is believing': Looking at EFL teachers' beliefs through classroom interaction. *Classroom Discourse, 2*, 39-57.

Mackey, A. (2007a). Introduction: The role of conversational interaction in second language acquisition. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 1-26). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mackey, A. (Ed.). (2007b). *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mackey, A., & Goo, J. (2007). Interaction research in SLA: A meta-analysis and research synthesis. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 407-452). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mackey, A., & Polio, C. (Eds.). (2009). *Mutliple perspectives on interaction*. New York: Routledge.

Mori, J. (2002). Task design, plan, and development of talk-in-interaction: An analysis of a small group activity in a Japanese language classroom. *Applied Linguistics, 23*, 323-347.

Mori, R. (2011). Teacher cognition in corrective feedback in Japan. *System, 39*, 451-467.

Morris, F. A., & Tarone, E. E. (2003). Impact of classroom dynamics on the effectiveness of recasts in second language acquisition. *Language Learning, 53*, 325-368.

Mullock, B. (2006). The pedagogical knowledge base of four TESOL teachers. *Modern Language Journal, 90*, 48-66.

Musumeci, D. (1996). Teacher-learner negotiation in content-based instruction: Communication at cross-purposes? *Applied Linguistics, 17*, 286-325.

Nassaji, H., & Wells, G. (2000). What's the use of 'triadic dialogue'?: An investigation of teacher-student interaction. *Applied Linguistics, 21*, 376-406.

Ohta, A. S. (2001). *Second language acquisition processes in the classroom: Learning Japanese*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ortega, L. (2005). For what and for whom is our research? The ethical as transformative lens in instructed SLA. *Modern Language Journal, 89*, 427-443.

Ortega, L. (2007). Meaningful L2 practice in foreign language classrooms: A cognitive-interactionist SLA perspective. In R. M. DeKeyser (Ed.), *Practice in a second language* (pp. 180-207). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding second language acquisition*. London: Hodder.

Ortega, L. (2012a). Epistemological diversity and moral ends of research in instructed SLA. *Language Teaching Research, 16*, 206-226.

Ortega, L. (2012b). Language acquisition research for language teaching: Choosing between application and relevance. In B. Hinger, E. M. Unterrainer & D. Newby (Eds.), *Sprachen lernen: Kompetenzen entwickeln? Performanzen (über)prüfen* (pp. 24-38). Wien: Präsens Verlag.

Park, Y. (2014). The roles of third-turn repeats in two L2 classroom interactional contexts. *Applied Linguistics, 35*, 145-167.

Richards, K. (2006). 'Being the teacher': Identity and classroom conversation. *Applied Linguistics, 27*, 51-77.

Ronfeldt, M., & Grossman, P. (2008). Becoming a professional: Experimenting with possible selves in professional preparation. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 35*, 41-60.

Scarino, A. (2005). Introspection and retrospection as windows on teacher knowledge, values, and ethical dispositions. In D. J. Tedick (Ed.), *Second language teacher education: International perspectives* (pp. 33-52). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Scarino, A. (2013). Language assessment literacy as self-awareness: Understanding the role of interpretation in assessment and in teacher learning. *Language Testing, 30,* 309-327.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Seedhouse, P. (2007). On ethnomethodological CA and 'linguistic CA': A reply to Hall. *Modern Language Journal, 91*, 527-533.

Slimani-Rolls, A. (2005). Rethinking task-based language learning. *Language Teaching Research, 9*, 195-218.

Swain, M., Brooks, L., & Tocalli-Beller, A. (2002). Peer-peer dialogue as a means of second language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22*, 171-185.

Talmy, S., & Richards, K. (2011). Theorizing qualitative research interviews in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics, 32*, 1-5.

ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Thoms, J. J. (2012). Classroom discourse in foreign language classrooms: A review of the literature. *Foreign Language Annals, 45*, S8-S27.

Toth, P. D. (2008). Teacher- and learner-led discourse in task-based grammar instruction: Providing procedural assistance for L2 morphosyntactic development. *Language Learning, 58*, 237-283.

Toth, P. D. (2011). Social and cognitive factors in making teacher-led classroom discourse relevant for second language development. *Modern Language Journal, 95*, 1-25.

Tsang, W. K. (2004). Teachers' personal practical knowledge and interactive decisions. *Language Teaching Research, 8*, 163-198.

Tsui, A. B. M. (2012). The dialectics of theory and practice in teacher knowledge development. In J. Hüttner, B. Mehlmauer-Larcher, S. Reichl & B. Schiftner (Eds.), *Theory and practice in EFL teacher education: Bridging the gap* (pp. 16-37). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Ushioda, E. (2011). Motivating learners to speak as themselves. In G. Murray, X. Gao & M. Lamb (Eds.), *Identity, motivation and autonomy in language learning* (pp. 14-33). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Van den Branden, K. (1997). Effects of negotiations on language learners' output. *Language Learning, 47*, 589-636.

Van den Branden, K. (2008). Negotiation of meaning in the classroom: Does it enhance reading comprehension? In J. Philp, R. Oliver & A. Mackey (Eds.), *Second language acquisition and the younger learner: Child's play?* (pp. 149-169). Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner*. London: Longman.

van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. New York: Longman.

van Lier, L. (2000). From input to affordance: Social-interactive learning from an ecological perspective. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 245-259). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: Teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research, 6*, 3-23.

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. London: Routledge.

Walsh, S. (2013). *Classroom discourse and teacher development*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Waring, H. Z. (2008). Using explicit positive assessment in the language classroom: IRF, feedback, and learning opportunities. *Modern Language Journal, 92*, 577-594.

Waring, H. Z. (2009). Moving out of IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback): A single case analysis. *Language Learning, 59*, 796-824.

Waring, H. Z. (2013). Doing being playful in the second language classroom. *Applied Linguistics, 34*, 191-210.

Waring, H. Z., Creider, S., Tarpey, T., & Black, R. (2012). A search for specificity in understanding CA and context. *Discourse Studies, 14*, 477-492.

Waring, H. Z., & Hruska, B. L. (2012). Problematic directives in pedagogical interaction. *Linguistics and Education, 23*, 289-300.

Wells, G. (1993). Reevaluating the IRF sequence: A proposal for the articulation of theories of activity and discourse for the analysis of teaching and learning in the classroom. *Linguistics and Education, 5*, 1-37.

Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.

Zeichner, K. M. (2005). A research agenda for teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (pp. 737-759). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

<A> APPENDIX

Transcription Conventions

T	teacher
S	student (not identified)
S1, S2, etc.	identified student
Ss	several students at once
(.)	pause, less than a second
(4)	pause in seconds
(( ))	field notes, transcriber's comments
=	no gap between turns
CARE	especially loud and emphatic
It's stupid.	private turn, spoken to oneself rather than to the whole class
seventeen/eighteen/teenagers	overlapping or simultaneous utterances by several students
[find someone]	
[boys]	overlap between teacher and student